

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 17, 2007, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 18, 19, and 24 were rejected. Additionally, claims 3, 6 – 8, 11, 13 – 17, and 20 – 23 were objected to. In response, Applicant has amended claims 19 and 21 – 24, canceled claims 1 – 18, and 20, and added new claims 25 – 34. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims the added claims and the below-provided remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 3, 6 – 8, 11, 13 – 17, and 20 – 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 19

Applicant has amended claim 19 to include the subject matter of claim 20. Claim 19 was previously indicated as including allowable subject matter. In view of the amendment, Applicant asserts that claim 19 is in allowable condition.

Claims 21 – 24 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 19. Claims 21 – 24 have been amended to refer to the “phase-locked loop” of claim 25.

New Claim 25 (1 + 21)

New claim 25 is formed by combination of the limitations of claims 19 and 21 as filed. Claim 21 was previously indicated as including allowable subject matter. Because new claim 25 includes the limitations of claims 19 and 21 as filed, Applicant asserts that new claim 25 is in allowable condition.

New claims 26 – 29 correspond to claims 20 and 22 – 24 as filed.

New Claim 30 (1 + 22)

New claim 30 is formed by combination of the limitations of claims 19 and 22 as filed. Claim 22 was previously indicated as including allowable subject matter. Because new claim 30 includes the limitations of claims 19 and 22 as filed, Applicant asserts that new claim 30 is in allowable condition.

New claims 31 – 34 correspond to claims 20, 21, 23, and 24 as filed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action states that the limitation “logic in signal communication with said counter” (lines 2 – 3), which term ‘signal communication’ makes it vague and unclear. It is not clear what term ‘signal communication’ is referring to.”

Claim 18 has been canceled and claim 24 has been amended to recite “logic connected to said counter” instead of “logic in signal communication with said counter.” Support for the amendment is found in Applicant’s specification, for example, at paragraph [0048] and Fig. 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: August 16, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111